DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 688 CE 064 691

AUTHOR	Hagen, Jan L.; Lurie, Irene
TITLE	Child Care Services and JOBS: Local Implementation.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Nelson A. Rockefeller Inst. of Government.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.; Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Foundation for Child Development, New York, N.Y.; New York State Dept. of Social Services, Albany.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-914341-29-4
PUB DATE	Jul 93
NOTE	57p.; For related documents, see CE 064 692-693.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Adult Programs; *Day Care; Economically Disadvantaged; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Financial Support; Information Services; National Surveys; Parent Education; Parent Participation; *Program Implementation; Referral; Welfare Recipients; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

As part of a 3-year, 10-state study on the state and local implementation of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Program, local implementation of child care services was researched. Areas of investigation focused on the availability of child care services, funding and payment mechanisms, parental choice, and information and referral services. Findings were based on field network research and a survey of front-line workers in all 10 states and in 29 of the 30 local sites. Findings indicated that, in general, JOBS administrators at both state and local levels perceived the supply of child care services as adequate, and the majority of front-line workers also regarded child care services as sufficiently available to service JOBS participants. Parental choice in selection of child care was preserved and safeguarded by the programs, although many sites placed a strong emphasis on use of formal child care services. Few local sites had begun to experience funding shortages for child care. Payment rates for child care services were sufficient to attract an adequate number of providers. Efforts to increase parent education about child care were related to use of information and referral services and use of child care management agencies. (Appendixes include a report that introduces the research on the JOBS program implementation, descriptions of workers responsible for child care services, a list of field associates, and brief biographies of each. Contains 11 data tables). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 688

CHILD CARE SERVICES AND JOBS:

LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J L Hagen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Jan L. Hagen
and
Irene Lurie

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government

State University of New York

CE064651

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHILD CARE SERVICES AND JOBS: LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

Jan L. Hagen and Irene Lurie

The Nelson A. Rockefeller
Institute of Government
State University of New York
Albany, New York

July 1993

Funding for this project has been provided by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the U.S. Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services, the New York Department of Social Services, and the Foundation for Child Development. The conclusions and opinions in this report reflect those of the authors and should not be construed as representing those of the funders.

© 1993
Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government
411 State Street, Albany, NY 12203

ISBN 0-914-341-29-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ii
Executive Summary iii
Introduction 1
Legislative Parameters for Child Care Services 4
Availability of Child Care Services 6
Types of Child Care Services Used 12
Funding for Child Care Services 15
Payment Rates for Child Care Services 16
Parental Choice 19
Discussion 24
Conclusion 28
References 29

Appendix A: Working Paper Series 31
Appendix B: Description of Workers Responsible for Child Care Services 39
Appendix C: Field Associates 43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Workers' Perceptions of Factors Limiting Supply of Child Care Providers 9

Table 2: Workers' Perceptions of Clients' Experiences with Child Care 9

Table 3: Child Care Workers' Perceptions of Barriers to Implementing JOBS 10

Table 4: Type of Child Care by County 13

Table 5: Percent of Children in Informal and Formal Care 14

Table 6: Methods of Payment for Child Care 17

Table 7: Workers' Perceptions of Agency Approaches to Child Care 23

Table A-1: Criteria for Selecting States 37

Table A-2: Local Sites Selected for the Study 38

Table B-1: Characteristics of Respondents Providing Child Care Services 40

Table B-2: Weekly Time Allocations for Workers Providing Child Care Services 42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

Under the auspices of the Rockefeller Institute of Government, a three-year, ten-state study is being conducted on the state and local implementation of the JOBS program. In this report, we present research findings on the local implementation of child care services in conjunction with the JOBS program, specifically on developments that have occurred in child care in conjunction with the implementation of the JOBS program. Areas of investigation focused on the availability of child care services, funding and payment mechanisms, parental choice, and information and referral services.

Background

The Family Support Act of 1988 introduced new legislation for welfare employment programs through its provisions for the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS) and associated child care services. The JOBS program is envisioned as a vehicle to foster the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC parents, primarily mothers, so they may financially support themselves and their children.

In introducing the JOBS legislation, Congress recognized that child care would be a critical variable in the ability of AFDC mothers to participate in education and training activities as well as to make the transition to employment and economic self-sufficiency. Therefore, the legislation provides that, if needed, child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC recipients participating in the JOBS program. Additionally, federal funding for child care was increased significantly under the legislation.

Methods

The findings presented here extend our earlier research regarding the initial responses of the ten states to the JOBS child care provisions and cover the field network research conducted on the local implementation of the JOBS program in 30 local sites—three in each state—during June through August, 1991. The ten states included in the study, selected to reflect diversity and a range of experiences in implementing the JOBS program, were Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. The 30 local sites were also selected to reflect a range of experiences, and within each

state, we selected a site that represented a larger, more urban location, one that reflected a mid-sized city within the state, and one that represented a small or rural community.

The primary data collection method was field network research. Field network research relies on a network of field researchers who are senior policy analysts and who assess the program in their assigned jurisdictions by using a uniform instrument for collecting and analyzing information. Field researchers gathered the required information in a variety of ways, including on-site observations, interviews with program administrators and staff, and reviews of program materials and reports.

The findings are also based on a survey of front-line workers conducted in all ten states and in 29 of the 30 local sites. The overall purpose of the survey was to further inform our analysis of the local implementation of the JOBS program by considering the perspective of those charged with its daily operations. To collect data, we distributed a self-administered questionnaire to front-line workers in the fall of 1991, shortly after the completion of the field network research. Completed questionnaires were returned by 929 respondents for a response rate of 68.7 percent. The findings presented here are based on the responses of front-line workers who were responsible for child care services (N=274). The survey's limitations stem from its reliance on a self-administered questionnaire, purposive selection of local sites, and geographic restrictions.

Findings

In general, JOBS administrators at both the state and local levels perceived the supply of child care services as adequate for their programs to serve a sufficient number of JOBS participants to meet the federal participation rate of seven percent for 1990 and 1991. Additionally, the majority of front-line workers responsible for child care services also regarded child care services as being sufficiently available to serve JOBS participants at the time of the study. The only site identified as having a significant concern about an adequate supply of child care services was New York City. This concern may well reflect the emphasis placed on formal care by the agency and the state's policy requiring that those clients requesting child care assistance be given the option of two regulated providers. The other major gap in child care services identified by several sites was care for infants and toddlers.

In interpreting these findings, one must carefully consider several important factors before concluding that child care is not, and will not

become, an issue in implementing the JOBS program. First, at the time of the study, the federal participation rate for the JOBS program was seven percent of the non-exempt AFDC caseload. For most states in this study, meeting this rate of participation was not a major challenge because they already had well developed welfare employment programs. Additionally, for states with new programs, clients were only beginning to flow through the JOBS program, and many were at the assessment and employability planning stages rather than assigned to a particular educational, training, or employment activity.

Second, child care services may be available, but JOBS participants may not be able to access those services due to a lack of available transportation. This issue was identified as significant in both the field network research and the survey of front-line workers. Third, the availability of services may also reflect a reliance on informal care, and its use may not be captured in the available state and local information. Informal care may be functioning as a "safety valve," as an alternative when formal care is not available or accessible.

Fourth, states were operating JOBS programs primarily on a voluntary basis or giving priority for services to volunteers during this study period. It is possible that those volunteering for the JOBS program have fewer needs for child care than other potential JOBS participants. Additionally, self-initiated participants who volunteer for the JOBS program may already have secured child care arrangements and enroll in the JOBS program in order to obtain payments for child care and other work-related expenses. Finally, recipients with significant needs for child care may be viewed as having barriers to program participation and thus may be less likely to be enrolled in JOBS activities. Given the need to serve only seven percent of the potential pool, JOBS programs may be choosing to serve those with lower needs for child care, in effect, creaming on the basis of child care needs. As demonstrated by New York City, it was possible to serve only clients with school-age children and meet the seven percent participation rate.

The JOBS legislation significantly increased the availability of child care funding for welfare employment programs, and this liberalized funding has made an important contribution to some states' operations of the JOBS program. However, accessing the federal funding for child care under the JOBS program is dependent on the states' being able to provide the required state matching funds. The limitations on child care funding have already resulted in restricting access to the JOBS program in at least one state and to restricting availability of child care support for other

low-income but non-AFDC families. The findings suggest that a few local sites have begun to experience, or anticipate, funding shortages for child care. In the three sites noting this concern, the depletion of Title XX funding for child care, which does not require a state match, was noted as a main factor creating this shortage of funding for child care services. As the federally mandated rates of JOBS participation increase, the likelihood of confronting inadequate child care funding will also increase.

Although addressed through a variety of approaches, parental choice in the selection of child care has been preserved and safeguarded by the programs considered in this study. There were indications that many sites placed a strong emphasis on the use of formal or regulated child care services. This emphasis was also reflected in data on service usage. However, the data on service usage may well minimize the extent to which informal care is used by JOBS participants. Parental choice may be restricted as a practical matter, however: formal child care services may not be available or accessible within some communities.

The issues of parental choice and informed consumer choice of child care services go hand-in-hand—to make informed choices, parents must have relevant information about child care options and child development. The findings suggest that efforts are underway in a number of states and local sites to increase parent education about child care. These developments were related to the use of information and referral services as well as the use of child care management agencies in Tennessee and Texas.

Although there were concerns in several sites about the payment rates for child care services—rates were considered both too low and too high—payment levels were sufficient to attract an adequate number of providers. However, an issue uncovered in several sites was the payment differential between those receiving services under the JOBS program and those receiving services through the JTPA agency. Authorized payments under the JOBS program for child care were higher than those under the JTPA program. This situation may create tension between the local agencies and could potentially interfere with the JTPA's providing services to JOBS participants. At a minimum, this situation places the JTPA agency at a disadvantage in arranging services for JTPA clients who are not also JOBS participants.

Conclusion

The JOBS legislation reflects the expectations that mothers, even those with young children, should participate in the labor force to increase their levels of economic self-sufficiency. This approach represents a dramatic shift from the original intentions of the AFDC program, which was to allow mothers to care for their children in their own homes. This change in expectations has been accompanied by the recognition that, to fulfill these expectations, mothers need access to child care services.

In implementing the JOBS program and the associated child care provisions, states to date have fulfilled their obligations to assure that child care is available and provided to at least enough JOBS participants to meet the federally mandated requirements for participation. But such child care issues as funding, access, and transportation must still be addressed by states.While these findings indicate that child care is not yet a pressing issue in the implementation of the JOBS program, it is clearly premature to conclude that it will not emerge as a significant barrier to providing education, training, and employment services to welfare recipients as the federally mandated rates of participation increase. Additionally, these findings provide the perspectives of the state and local agency administrators and workers, not those of the clients, who may view the issue of child care quite differently and who may find that child care issues become barriers to their on-going participation in the JOBS program and in the workplace.

INTRODUCTION

Although work incentives and requirements have been tied to AFDC since the late 1960s, the Family Support Act of 1988 signals a clear shift to expecting labor force participation by mothers with young children who receive welfare benefits. The Family Support Act seeks to increase the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC families through increased levels of child support enforcement and a new welfare-to-work program that provides education, training, and employment services to AFDC recipients. This new welfare employment program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS), replaces the Work Incentive Program (WIN) and is designed "to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence" (42 USC 681 (a)). In introducing the JOBS program, Congress recognized that child care would be a critical variable in the ability of AFDC mothers to participate in education and training activities as well as to make the transition to employment and economic self-sufficiency. Therefore, the legislation provides that, if needed, child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC recipients participating in the JOBS program. Additionally, federal funding for child care was increased significantly in the legislation.

This report presents research findings from the JOBS Implementation Study related to the local implementation of child care services under the JOBS program. These findings extend our earlier research regarding the initial responses of ten states to the JOBS child care provisions (Hagen & Lurie, 1992; Hagen & Lurie, 1993) and cover the field network research conducted on the local implementation of the JOBS program in 30 local sites—three in each state—during June through August, 1991. (More information on the JOBS Implementation Study is presented in Appendix A.) Areas of investigation focused on the availability of child care services, funding and payment mechanisms, parental choice, and information and referral services. This phase of the study excluded consideration of transitional benefits for child care services because programs were in early stages of implementation. This phase of the work also preceded the implementation of the Child Care and Development Block grant.

The states selected for inclusion in the study were Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. In choosing these states, we made an effort to select states that illustrated a range of experiences in implement-

ing the JOBS program and to provide diversity according to such characteristics as the region of the country, the level of fiscal stress expected in 1990, poverty rate, per capita income, and the program's organization structure, i.e., state-administered or county-administered welfare system. (For further information regarding study methods, see Hagen & Lurie, 1992.)

Thirty local sites, three in each state, were selected for examining the implementation of the JOBS program on the local level. Again, in selecting the local sites, we tried to reflect a range of experiences with the JOBS program. A number of criteria were considered in site selection: the size of the AFDC caseload, the geographic location within the state, and the fiscal and economic conditions of the community. Within each state, we selected a site that represented a larger, more urban location, one that reflected a mid-sized city within the state, and one that represented a small or rural community.

The findings presented here also include the perspectives of front-line workers responsible for child care services that we obtained through a survey conducted in the fall of 1991, shortly after the field network research was completed and approximately one year after the mandated implementation of the JOBS program. The survey of front-line workers providing JOBS services was conducted in all the local sites selected for the overall study except New York City, where we were unable to secure permission to conduct the study. The intent of this survey was to further inform our analysis of the local implementation of the JOBS program by including the front-line workers' perspective on how policies were implemented and the extent to which resources were available to provide services to JOBS participants. (The study methodology as well as the overall findings from the survey of front-line workers are presented in Hagen, Lurie, & Wang, 1993.)

Of the front-line workers responding to the survey, 274 or 29.5 percent indicated they had responsibilities for assisting clients with child care services. The findings reported here are based on the responses of that specific group of front-line workers. It was assumed that they were the most knowledgeable about the child care services in their agencies and about the use of these services by JOBS participants. Although comparisons across the states are made in some instances, these must be interpreted with caution because of the relatively small numbers of responses used for some statistical analyses. (Appendix B provides additional information about the front-line workers providing child care services.)

To place these findings in context, we begin with a summary of the federal legislation related to JOBS participation and child care services. We then present findings on the availability of child care service, the funding for child care and payment rates, and the issue of parental choice in selecting child care services. While the focus here is on the local implementation of the child care services under the JOBS program, findings regarding state choices relevant to child care are summarized to provide the context for understanding the local implementation of child care services in conjunction with the JOBS program.

LEGISLATIVE PARAMETERS FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

The federal legislation provides that, if needed, child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC recipients participating in the JOBS program. In a significant departure from previous legislation, Congress also authorized the provision of transitional child care for up to 12 months to families who become ineligible for AFDC because of earned income. Federal funding for child care, which was capped and severely constrained under WIN, was significantly liberalized under the Family Support Act and was made an open-ended federal entitlement. State expenditures are matched at the Medicaid rate, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent, depending on the state's per capita income.

The legislation also reflects the increasing acceptance of employment by mothers with young children. Prior federal legislation regarding work expectations for AFDC centered on mothers with children ages six and older. Under the JOBS legislation, mothers with children ages three or older are required to participate in this welfare employment program if child care is available. Additionally, states may elect to require participation by mothers with children ages one year or older. For these mothers with young children, states may require participation for up to 20 hours each week. Responding specifically to the risk that minor custodial parents will become long-term welfare recipients, Congress also mandated that mothers under 20 years of age who have not completed high school or its equivalent be required to participate in educational activities, regardless of their children's ages.

Under the Act, state welfare agencies retained considerable authority and discretion in the implementation of the child care provisions. An important funding issue faced by the states is the allocation of funds to support child care services under AFDC and the extent to which they will draw on other sources, such as Title XX, the Social Services Block Grant. States are allowed to determine the method of payment for child care. These options include providing care directly, purchasing care under contract, using vouchers, providing cash advances, providing reimbursement, or using the child care disregard, which is the amount of earnings that may be set aside for child care before the AFDC grant is reduced because of earnings. States also retain some discretion over the amount of payment for child care. States may pay the actual cost of child care up to the local market rates for child care, but they are not required to pay

more than the child care disregard, which is equal to $175 per month for children ages two and older and $200 per month for younger children.

In order to require participation in the JOBS program by mothers with children under six, the state must assure the necessary child care. The state is required to provide, either directly or through others, information regarding the types and locations of services and to inform clients that assistance is available in selecting appropriate care for their children. Additionally, the agency must provide assistance in obtaining child care services if it is requested.

Parental choice in selecting child care services has been a central premise in the development of the legislation as well as the federal regulations which stipulate "that consistent with individual responsibility is choice, and that parents be given a wide range of options for child care while participating in this program" (Federal Register, 1989, p. 42149).

These legislative and regulatory parameters provide the foundation for the states' choices in implementing the child care provisions of the Family Support Act, and they present both challenges and opportunities to the state and local agencies charged with the implementation of JOBS. In this study, we have examined the local responses to these provisions. In other words, what developments in child care services have occurred in conjunction with the implementation of the JOBS program?

AVAILABILITY OF CHILD CARE SERVICES

During the initial phase of this study, conducted during October through December 1990, we found that administrators in nine of the states anticipated a supply of child care services sufficient to meet the needs of those participating in the JOBS program. However, they acknowledged that providers in rural areas were somewhat limited. Locating and arranging both infant care and shift care were acknowledged as problematic areas in Texas. In contrast to the other states, in New York there was a more general concern among state officials about an adequate supply of child care slots to meet the needs of JOBS participants. New York was also the only state with an explicit parental choice policy that affects the state's need for regulated child care: if a client requests assistance in locating child care, state law requires that the client be offered two choices of regulated providers. Michigan officials, while not identifying an insufficient supply of child care services for JOBS participants as a concern, recognized a shortage of child care generally in the state. This shortage, while not directly interfering with participation in their JOBS program, increased the difficulty faced by front-line workers in arranging child care for JOBS participants.

Based on our initial findings, we also concluded that, during the initial stages of JOBS implementation, states had not experienced major changes in the types of child care used or the extent to which a particular type of care was used by welfare recipients. There were suggestions from both Maryland and Texas, however, that informal child care may be expanding. Under the JOBS program in Texas, the range of child care options increased: parents now have the choice of using self-arranged care provided by neighbors, friends, or non-parenting relatives. This suggests that more child care used by welfare recipients may be provided in informal settings as the JOBS program expands. This may be tempered, however, by the state's procedures for reimbursing informal child care services.

Local Implementation

Without exception, all local sites reported a supply of child care services that was adequate to meet the needs of their JOBS participants during June-August 1991, a time period in which sites were required to meet a seven percent rate of participation. Although the availability of child care services was not a constraint in operating local JOBS programs, specific gaps in service were noted in several locations. Particular note

was made of a shortage of care for infants or toddlers in eight of the sites, and three sites noted shortages for evening, night, or weekend care.

The findings also suggest that the availability of child care services in the more rural areas of a county or district may be a factor limiting JOBS participation in some instances. For example, in the area served by the Springfield, Oregon site and in Harris County, which includes Houston, child care services are less available in the outlying or more rural sections of the county or district. In two rural counties (Tuscola, Michigan and LeFlore, Oklahoma), the availability of child care services was limited.

Other rural counties, however, reported an adequate supply to meet the needs of their JOBS participants, and some rural counties have well developed initiatives for dealing with the need for child care services. For example, in Franklin County, New York, the local welfare agency, along with other service providers, responded to the need for more child care services during the 1980s when welfare employment programs were introduced in the state. Their approach has been to develop a network of family day care providers distributed throughout the county. Given the rural character of the county, child care centers were regarded as inappropriate to local needs because they require a minimal number of children on a regular basis to insure on-going operations. Family day care homes, however, can be much more flexible in the number of children served and still stay in operation. They can also be located throughout the county rather than in a more centralized location. Additionally, the county and its cooperating agencies have invested in vans to provide transportation for their clients and their children.

In two instances, local administrators thought that the supply of child care was not adequate and that it could potentially limit their ability to serve JOBS participants. In Tuscola County, a rural area of Michigan, the supply of child care services was regarded as inadequate, particularly for those JOBS participants entering employment. Until recently, there was only one child care facility in the area. However, in response to the demand for more child care services, more facilities were under development.

The other site reporting a serious concern about the availability of child care services was New York City. Although the availability of child care services was not limiting New York City's ability to meet the seven percent participation rate, welfare agency administrators perceived the supply of child care providers as being inadequate, particularly for regulated care for infants and toddlers. Additionally, certain geographic areas within New York City had a shortage of regulated child care. This

perceived shortage of regulated providers, combined with the agency's policy of encouraging formal care, resulted in mandating JOBS participation in New York City only for those individuals with children ages six and older until 1992.

Although child care services were generally available in the local sites, they were not always accessible to some clients. For those clients, the lack of transportation interfered with their ability to access the available services or restricted their choice of child care services. Program administrators from five of the local sites noted the availability of transportation as a factor limiting access to child care services. Transportation difficulties arose in some rural areas, but they also occurred in moderate sized communities that lack public transportation systems. An additional barrier in one site was the lack of JOBS funding to pay for transportation to child care services.

The Workers' Perspective

In the survey of front-line workers, workers responsible for child care services answered a series of questions about the availability of child care providers for JOBS participants in their agencies' programs. Overall, 64 percent of the respondents indicated that sufficient providers were available for the children of JOBS participants. Workers in Oklahoma and Oregon were more likely than workers in other states to identify a sufficient number of child care providers. In contrast, only 10 percent of the workers in Maryland believed that the supply of providers was sufficient. The key factor perceived by respondents in all states as limiting the supply of child care providers was cumbersome reimbursement procedures, followed by a shortage of child care generally in a community and the clients' lack of transportation to available providers (table 1).

Sixty percent of the respondents perceived clients with children under 18 months as frequently encountering difficulties in arranging child care (table 2). This was noted particularly by workers in Maryland and Mississippi. Arranging care for toddlers was also perceived as being frequently difficult by 27.9 percent of the respondents. These survey findings parallel the findings from the field network research, which indicated that some areas had particular difficulties in locating care for children in these age groups. Somewhat unexpected was the finding that one- third of the respondents perceived clients with children over 12 years of age as frequently experiencing difficulties in arranging child care. However, children in this age group who require child care may be children with special needs.

Table 1: Workers' Perceptions of Factors Limiting Supply of Child Care Providers

Factor	Percent Agreeing
Reimbursement procedures are cumbersome to providers.	69.7
There is a shortage of child care in the community in general.	62.8
Clients lack transportation to available providers.	62.2
Payments are too low to be acceptable to providers.	58.0
The hours providers are available do not coincide with the scheduled activities for participants.	43.8

Table 2: Workers' Perceptions of Clients' Experiences with Child Care

Statement	Percent Agreeing
Clients with children in the following categories encounter difficulties in arranging child care:	
Under 18 months	60.1
18 months to age 3	27.9
Over age 3 but under age 5	16.6
Age 5 to age 12	16.7
Over age 12	33.8

Workers were also asked to rate the importance of potential problems or barriers that their agencies might be encountering in implementing the JOBS program (table 3). Of particular interest here is that the child care workers rated transportation issues as more important barriers to JOBS implementation than child care funding and the availability of child care providers. These latter items ranked sixth and seventh among the twelve factors considered. From the perspective of workers responsible for child care services, transportation barriers to JOBS implementation were more significant. This was particularly the case in Mississippi, where all of the respondents noted the lack of available transportation and of funding for

Table 3: Child Care Workers' Perceptions of Barriers to Implementing JOBS (N=274)

Barrier	Percent Agreeing
Lack of employment opportunities in the community	65.6
Inadequate funding for education and training services	63.5
Inadequate funding for transportation	56.9
Inadequate staffing for JOBS program in the agency	55.7
Lack of available transportation in the community	53.1
Inadequate funding for child care	51.8
Lack of child care providers	49.3
Lack of available education and training services in the community	48.2
Lack of staff knowledge about the JOBS program	37.7
Agency rules and regulations too complex to implement properly	32.6
Assignment of unnecessary or inappropriate services because of 20-hour JOBS activity requirement	29.1
Unrealistic expectations for most clients	28.2

transportation as important factors in hindering JOBS implementation. As noted in the field network research, the lack of funding for transportation or the lack of available transportation within a community limits clients' access to child care providers as well as to education and training opportunities. Although child care providers may be available in sufficient numbers within a community to meet the needs of JOBS participants, transportation difficulties interfere with accessing those services and thus hinder participation in the JOBS program.

Initiatives to Increase the Supply of Services

Given that most of the local sites were not encountering any pressing problems in the availability of child care services, few initiatives to increase the supply of child care were identified. Of the local sites, New

York City was the most active in terms of developing additional regulated child care services for JOBS participants. This has been accomplished by allocating an increased number of the city's funded child care slots to JOBS participants. Some of these slots have been targeted specifically for infants and toddlers in group and family day care as well as for children of teen parents, including on-site care for children of teen parents in educational programs. To secure these openings and services, New York City relies on requests for proposals as well as the recruitment of private day care programs.

Philadelphia has also worked to increase the supply of formal providers by negotiating a special agreement with a group of 70 to 80 day care facilities for direct payment from the Department of Public Welfare to the day care provider. This method assures payments to the providers and may increase their willingness to serve subsidized children in their facilities.

In Texas, efforts to increase the supply and the quality of child care services were underway in all three local sites. These efforts are directed and financed primarily by the child care brokers, referred to as the Child Care Management Agency (CCMA) in Texas. As part of their contracts with the state welfare office, CCMAs must develop new child care resources where needed, train and certify staff, and fulfill related activities. In two of the counties, planning was underway for a new project to serve in-school teen parents and their children at three local schools. Funding for the project will come from several sources, including the JOBS program and the Child Care and Development Block Grant, and will be handled by the CCMA.

TYPES OF CHILD CARE SERVICES USED

Table 4 provides information on the numbers of children receiving child care services under the JOBS program and the type of setting in which this care is provided. The variation in the number of children served by the local sites was extreme, ranging from almost 4,000 children in Baltimore City to nine children in Gibson County, Tennessee. The extent to which the various types of child care settings were used was also highly variable.

One issue related to the JOBS program and the use of child care has been the extent to which JOBS participants will either prefer or be forced to rely on informal child care providers for their children. Table 5 provides percentages for the use of formal and informal care in the local sites. (The table assumes that family day care homes are formal care settings. New York City was excluded in this analysis because information on children in informal child care settings was not available.) It is immediately obvious that these data do not reflect a high use of informal care in these local sites. The Mississippi sites relied most heavily on informal child care, followed by Tennessee and Maryland. That reliance may reflect a lack of available child care facilities in the less urbanized sites in these states. But even in these latter two states, formal care is used extensively. The use of formal child care is clearly the pattern in New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas.

On the basis of this information, it is possible to speculate that formal child care was indeed available for many, if not most, children of JOBS participants at the time of the study. However, it is also possible that JOBS participants are relying heavily on informal care that is not captured in these data. For example, JOBS participants in Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas who have opted to use informal care without securing payment would not be counted in these data. As noted, data regarding the use of informal care in New York City was not available. Program administrators at that site estimated that 70 to 80 percent of their clients rely on informal child care arrangements.

Table 4: Type of Child Care by County [1]

State	Site	Date	Total[2] Children	Care By a Relative: In Child's Home	Care By a Relative: Outside Child's Home	Care Provided By a Non-Relative: In Child's Home	Care Provided By a Non-Relative: Family Day Care Home	Care Provided By a Non-Relative: Child Care Center
MD	Baltimore	4/91	3,947	570(14)	327 (8)	379(10)	1,272(32)	1,399(35)
	Anne Arundel	6/91	343	0 (0)	65(19)	59(17)	84(24)	135(39)
	Dorchester	7/91	29	8(28)	0 (0)	4(14)	6(21)	11(38)
MI		(Not Available)						
MN		(Not Available)						
MS	Hinds	6/91	236	67(28)	40(17)	13 (6)	64(27)	52(22)
	Harrison	6/91	446	41 (9)	126(28)	11 (2)	93(21)	175(39)
	Quitman	6/91	70	28(40)	12(17)	22(31)	0 (0)	7(10)
NY	NYC	8/91	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	985	4,820
	Oneida	8/91	191	7 (4)	32(18)	28(15)	117(61)	7 (4)
	Franklin	8/91	16	1 (6)	2(13)	0 (0)	11(69)	2(13)
OK	Tulsa	1/91	293	—	—	2 (0)	29(10)	262(89)
	Carter	1/91	134	—	—	2 (2)	7 (5)	125(93)
	LeFlore	1/91	204	—	—	0 (0)	74(36)	130(64)
OR	Springfield	6/91	378	0 (0)	64(17)	0 (0)	237(62)	77(20)
	Medford	6/91	435	0 (0)	88(19)	0 (0)	289(64)	76(17)
	LaGrande	6/91	103	0 (0)	13(13)	0 (0)	77(74)	14(13)
PA		(Not Available)						
TN	Davidson	6/91	192	4 (2)	11 (6)	0 (0)	36(19)	141(73)
	Sullivan	6/91	36	4(11)	6(17)	6(17)	0 (0)	20(56)
	Gibson	6/91	9	0 (0)	2(22)	2(22)	0 (0)	5(56)
TX	Harris	6/91	2,408	5 (0)	14 (1)	2 (0)	23 (1)	2,364(98)
	Neuces	6/91	309	0 (0)	2 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	306(99)
	Bee	6/91	21	0 (0)	1 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20(95)

[1] Numbers in () are percentages.

[2] Total number of children receiving child care services for the month; Form FSA-104, Part II, page 2, line 1.

N/A = Not Available; "—" = Program does not pay for the service.

Table 5: Percent of Children in Informal and Formal Care*

State	Site	Percent Informal	Percent Formal
Maryland	Baltimore	32	67
	Anne Arundel	36	63
	Dorchester	42	59
Michigan			(Not Available)
Minnesota			(Not Available)
Mississippi	Hinds	51	49
	Harrison	39	60
	Quitman	88	10
New York	NYC		(Not Available)
	Oneida	37	65
	Franklin	19	82
Oklahoma	Tulsa	0	99
	Carter	2	98
	LeFlore	0	100
Oregon	Springfield	17	82
	Medford	19	81
	LaGrande	13	87
Pennsylvania			(Not Available)
Tennessee	Davidson	8	92
	Sullivan	45	56
	Gibson	44	56
Texas	Harris	1	99
	Nueces	1	99
	Bee	5	95

* Informal care includes care by a relative in the child's home or outside the child's home and care by a non-relative in the child's home. Formal care includes family day care and child care centers.

FUNDING FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

The open-ended federal entitlement for child care under the JOBS program represents a potentially significant change in the availability of child care funding, provided that states are willing and able to generate the required state matching funds. At the time of our study on initial state responses to the JOBS legislation (October through December 1990), administrators in all states expected to have sufficient funds for child care services to meet the federally mandated participation rate of seven percent for 1990 and 1991. However, administrators in Tennessee and Texas recognized the *potential* need to restrict access to the JOBS program because of insufficient child care funding. To control child care costs in its program, Minnesota restricted access to the JOBS program in May 1990 by narrowing the groups eligible for services.

During June to August, 1991, funding for child care services was not identified as a problem in 29 of the 30 local sites. The only site reporting a shortage of funding for child care was Philadelphia, where the problem had only emerged recently. As Philadelphia's more intensive JOBS program, Single-Point-of-Contact (SPOC), has grown, funding limitations for child care services have become a factor in program participation. The funding limitations have resulted in significant waiting lists for Title XX funding for child care services and have forced some clients to postpone participation in JOBS activities. At the time of the study, the scope of this problem was not well understood. Additionally, two local sites in Texas expected to encounter funding shortages in the relatively near future due to the increase in caseloads, the increasing participation rates, and the depletion of available Title XX funding for child care.

PAYMENT RATES FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

The payment methods chosen by the states are shown in table 6. The range in choices runs from using only one method, which Oregon selected, to using all five methods, which New York selected. The most frequently selected option was purchase of service; only New York included providing cash in advance as an optional method for child care payments.

A major decision for states in conjunction with the JOBS program was whether to pay up to the local market rate for child care. All but one of the study states elected to base their allowable child care payments on local market rates. The range in state payment limits for child care is shown in table 6. Michigan, which elected to limit the amount of payment to the monthly child care disregard, provided the lowest level of payment, while New York, with a state-wide limit of $883.32, allowed for the highest payment rate.

With the exception of the local sites in Michigan, the local sites in this study were authorized to pay up to the market rates for child care services. In general, these rates were regarded as adequate to attract a sufficient number of providers for children of JOBS participants requiring care. In five local sites, however, payment rates for child care were considered too low for the local communities. In LaGrande, Oregon, for example, the authorized market rates for child care have fallen below the prevailing child care rates in the community. The authorized market rates were also considered too low in both Bee and Nueces counties in Texas, but for a different reason. In Texas, the market rates were determined for each of the state's regions. For both Corpus Christi and Beeville, the market rates were based on those for the entire Rio Grande Valley region and fell below the prevailing rates existing in those particular communities. This problem was not experienced in Harris County because the county, which includes Houston, dominates the region used for determining the market rate.

In contrast, the market rates were regarded as being too high for two rural sites. In Franklin County, New York, the local agency elected not to pay the authorized market rate for child care services. The market rates set for the community by the state were much higher than many private payers in the community could afford, including employees in the local welfare agency. The agency administrator decided to pay the going rates in the community. While acknowledging that this decision has allowed

Table 6: Methods of Payment for Child Care [1]

State	Method of Payment	Statewide Limit Per Month [2]
Maryland	Income Disregard, Voucher in Advance, Purchase ofService	328.95/$268.75
Michigan	Direct, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	200/$175
Minnesota[3]	Income Disregard, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	617/$538; $4,300–handicapped
Mississippi	Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$216/$204
New York	Direct, Income Disregard, Cash in Advance, Voucher in Advance, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service, Other	883.32
Oklahoma	Direct, Voucher in Advance, Purchase of Service	372/$341
Oregon	Direct	$450
Pennsylvania[3]	Income Disregard, Cash in Advance, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service, Other	580.50
Tennessee	Income Disregard, Purchase of Service	$270.90/$227.90
Texas	Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$482; $916–handicapped

[1] Source: Summary of Options under the Supportive Services Plan prepared by Family Support Administration, Office of Family Assistance, JOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program) Task Force, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 12/10/90.

[2] When two amounts are shown separated by a slash (/), the first amount is the statewide limit for children under 2. The second amount is the statewide limit for children over 2. Statewide limits for handicapped children are so captioned when different limits apply.

[3] Source: State Plan for Supportive Services.

the agency to save money, the agency administrator emphasized that this decision avoided the negative community response to welfare employment programs that would occur if welfare recipients were paying more than local workers can afford to pay for child care.

The other rural site that found the authorized payment levels too high for the local community was Tuscola, Michigan. In this instance, however, the issue was not one of market rate payments. In Michigan, child care payments are limited to the amount of payment for the monthly child care disregard. This amount is limited to $200 for children under two years of age and $175 for children over two years of age. This rate was regarded as too high for the more rural site, but the Wayne County site (Detroit) reported that the child care payment limits were too low for some providers in their area and sometimes created difficulties in accessing particular types of child care services.

At least two local sites confronted another market rate payment issue, the authorization for higher child care payments under the JOBS program than under JTPA programs. For example, the welfare agency in Davidson County, Tennessee, which includes Nashville, had been paying less for center-based child care than authorized under the market rate in the state. To prevent differential rates for JOBS and JTPA participants, payments for child care for JOBS participants were held to the levels used by the JTPA program for non- JOBS enrollees. In contrast, in Harris County, Texas, which includes Houston, the welfare agency paid higher rates than the JTPA. As a result, the local JTPA agency—which was expected to serve most JOBS participants on a non-reimbursable basis—was having difficulty finding child care services for its non-JOBS enrollees because child care for JOBS participants offered not only higher rates, but also more flexible hours.

In several local sites, the method of payment was regarded as a serious issue. All three sites in Michigan and one site in Pennsylvania reported that direct payment to the client introduced instances in which child care providers were not paid the total amount due or not paid at all. In other words, some clients were "skimming" from the child care payments. Workers in these sites expressed a preference for direct or vendor payment to the providers in order to avoid the possibility of misuse of child care funds by JOBS participants.

PARENTAL CHOICE

A major concern in requiring parents with preschool children to participate in JOBS activities has been the degree of parental choice that will be offered to parents in arranging child care. New York was the only state in the study to develop an explicit legislative policy regarding parental choice: if a client requests assistance in locating child care, the agency is required by state law to offer at least two choices of providers who are regulated, accessible, and available and who are willing to accept the amount or type of payment offered. If the agency is unable to provide these choices, the agency must offer the client the option of obtaining her own child care and excuse her from participation until child care is located by either the client or the agency. The intent of this state provision was to protect parents from being required to use unregulated child care in order to participate in the JOBS program.

Although New York was the only state with an explicit legislative policy regarding parental choice, other states have addressed this issue through different mechanisms. One approach has been to educate the consumer about selecting quality child care that matches the needs of the child. For example, Oregon required each of its local districts to provide consumer education services to inform JOBS participants about the availability of child care, as well as to stress that selecting child care is based on the parents' choices, not those of agency personnel.

Pennsylvania illustrates a second approach for both providing consumer education and expanding access to providers. The state developed a demonstration project covering 68 percent of the state's AFDC population that established county-based programs to assist families in locating community providers, to counsel families on selecting child care services, and to manage payment to providers. In other states, similar services emphasizing parental choice were to be provided by the local IV-A agency staff. In some states, however, parents were viewed as assuming primary responsibility for selecting and arranging child care with little formalized assistance.

Local Implementation

Parental choice of child care services was most clearly stressed in all three of the local sites in Oregon and in two of the New York local sites. In Oregon, all JOBS participants were referred to the local child care resource and referral program for assistance in locating child care and in

making decisions about the kind of child care that suits their needs. The client must be offered at three least child care options; however, none of these must necessarily be a licensed provider. In New York, parental choice was stressed through the state's requirement that the client who requests assistance be offered two licensed or regulated child care options.

Other local sites—those in Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee—protected parental choice by adapting a position of neutrality on the parents' choice of provider. The local sites in Maryland and Oklahoma along with New York City encouraged the use of formal, regulated care when it was available. In the Texas sites, informal care was indirectly discouraged through the payment procedures used for informal care. Under the state's policy, clients using informal care must seek reimbursement through the state welfare agency. These payments often were delayed for three or more months. Further, the State Comptroller's Office was authorized to withhold child care payments if the client had unpaid loans or bills with the state.

Parental choice also may be limited as a practical matter—the lack of licensed providers and of public transportation in an area may restrict the child care options. As one field associate noted:

> When an AFDC parent must get one or more children to a child care provider and herself to work—and does not have a car and lives in an area with no public transportation system—the barriers to the use of licensed child care and indeed employment, training, or education can be daunting. Thus, even though JOBS participants have the *right* to use regulated child care, many of them as a practical matter lack the *opportunity* to use such care.

Child Care Information and Assistance

To make parental choice meaningful, parents must be informed consumers of child care services and, if needed, have access to assistance in obtaining child care services. In all sites, assistance in arranging child care was available to JOBS participants. However, the agency providing this service and the extent of the service was highly variable. Responsibility for assistance in arranging child care for JOBS participants rested with the local welfare office in Maryland, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. In Michigan, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, these responsibilities were fulfilled directly by the local welfare

agency. In the Pennsylvania sites, the agencies reported that most clients neither need nor request assistance in finding a child care provider. The Michigan sites, by contrast, found that child care responsibilities placed a tremendous demand on the program's front-line workers. In Oklahoma, assisting clients with child care arrangements was an integral part of the caseworker's job. For these workers, providing child care assistance was facilitated by the use of a computerized system which allowed for on-screen and print-out viewing of available child care options.

In the local sites in Maryland, New York, and Oregon, assistance in arranging child care was facilitated through referral to specialized child care services. In Maryland, the state created a child care information and referral system. This system allows JOBS participants to access a special telephone service that provides the names, addresses, and phone numbers of three child care providers within the participants' immediate area. In New York, for both New York City and Oneida county, the option existed for local workers to refer JOBS participants to local child care resource and referral agencies. As noted earlier, Oregon referred all JOBS participants to local resource and referral programs.

Child Care Management Systems

Three states in the study developed child care management systems to fulfill responsibilities for child care services in conjunction with the JOBS program and transitional benefits. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas all established contracts with regionally based agencies to handle specific aspects of child care, including administration of child care payments and state and federal reporting.

In the local sites in Tennessee, community action agencies and other local organizations served as the child care brokers for the transitional benefits as well as for JOBS-related child care. These brokers were the key providers of assistance for parents who needed child care. Clients received individualized counseling services regarding available child care options, and they were encouraged to visit providers before making a choice. If a client selected an unregulated family care provider, an agency staff member visited the home to determine its acceptability. If the choice was an acceptable one, the agency entered into a contract with the provider and paid the provider directly. If the choice of provider was questionable, the client was counseled about the desirability of considering other providers.

The Texas sites also used child care management agencies (CCMA) that provide comprehensive child care assistance, including educational

resources on what to look for in quality child care, the types and locations of providers, and specific referrals. The Texas system was the most comprehensive of the three broker systems examined in this study. Of particular note was the emphasis given to providing "seamless" child care through the use of multiple funding sources and the development of additional resources.

In Mississippi, the child care management agencies were also responsible for the administration of child care under the JOBS program, but the staff of the child care management agencies seldom had direct contact with the clients. The CCMAs provided information regarding child care options to clients by means of a letter; the client was responsible for obtaining the child care services and for making the arrangements with the provider. Finalizing the arrangements and obtaining payment involved numerous steps for both the client and the provider. The provider and the client had to sign a contract, and the provider had to send a Notice of Action to the CCMA. The CCMA then notified the provider that the eligible child could be enrolled and the provider notified the client. Every month, the JOBS case manager was required to send attendance reports to the CCMA for participants receiving child care. These have been the basis for determining the payment to the provider. Participants are responsible for getting attendance reports to the case managers when the client is not enrolled in a formal education or training program.

The Workers' Perspective

Workers responsible for child care services were asked to assess their agencies' approach to child care services to determine if emphasis was being given to particular types of care (i.e., informal vs. formal care) and if the use of child care referral and resource services was encouraged. We also sought their perception of clients' being able to select their preferred type of care. The majority of child care workers viewed their agencies' approach to child care services as encouraging clients to make their own child care arrangements (table 7). Workers were most likely to view their agency's approach as encouraging self-arranged care in Michigan, Mississippi, and Oregon. Although this finding may suggest that JOBS participants must assume primary responsibility for locating child care, it may also reflect, in part, the emphasis given to parental choice in selecting child care services.

Only slightly more than one-fifth of the respondents regarded their agencies as promoting the use of informal rather than formal child care arrangements. However, workers in Maryland were most likely (50.4 percent) to agree with this statement as reflecting the agencies' approach

Table 7: Workers' Perceptions of Agency Approaches to Child Care

Statement	Percent Agreeing
Clients are encouraged to make their own arrangements for child care.	63.1
Child care is viewed as an opportunity to enhance the emotional and cognitive development of children.	35.7
Clients are encouraged to use a child care broker or resource and referral agency to assist in arranging child care.	35.4
The use of family members or friends to provide child care is encouraged rather than more formal child care arrangements.	21.6
Clients would prefer different child care arrangements, but they are unable to find them.	19.2

to child care. Additionally, 41.7 percent of the Maryland workers perceived their clients as preferring different child care arrangements, but unable to find them. Across the states, only 19.2 percent of the respondents agreed with that statement.

Slightly more than one-third of the respondents indicated that the use of child care resource and referral agencies was encouraged within their agencies. As might be anticipated, this was particularly the case in Tennessee and Texas (60 and 70 percent respectively), which have established child care brokers or management agencies. (Although Mississippi also has a child care management system, that system functions in a very different fashion, as described earlier.)

DISCUSSION

The findings presented here outline patterns emerging in child care services for JOBS participants during the initial stages of JOBS implementation in ten states and 30 local programs within those states. The findings are restricted to those states and local sites and may not reflect patterns for child care in other JOBS programs. Additionally, these findings reflect the status of child care services as viewed by state and local administrators as well as front-line workers. Specifically excluded in these findings is any assessment by clients themselves regarding child care services under the JOBS program. Although the findings have these limitations, they do provide an in-depth consideration of important child care issues associated with the implementation of the JOBS program.

In general, JOBS administrators at both the state and local levels perceived the supply of child care services as adequate for their programs to serve a sufficient number of JOBS participants to meet the federal participation rate of seven percent for 1990 and 1991. Additionally, the majority of workers responsible for child care services also regarded child care services as being sufficiently available to serve JOBS participants at the time of the study. The only site identified as having a significant concern about an adequate supply of child care services was New York City. This concern may well reflect the emphasis place on formal care by the agency and the state's policy requiring that those clients requesting child care assistance be given the option of two regulated providers. The other major gap in child care services identified by several sites was care for infants and toddlers.

Some may regard these findings as unexpected, particularly given current information about the availability of child care in general. In interpreting these findings, we must carefully consider several important factors before concluding that child care is not, and will not become, an issue in implementing the JOBS program (Hagen & Lurie, 1993). First, at the time of the study, the federal participation rate for the JOBS program was seven percent of the non-exempt AFDC caseload. For most states in this study, meeting this rate of participation was not a major challenge because they already had well developed welfare employment programs. Additionally, for states with new programs, clients were only beginning to flow through the JOBS program, and many were at the assessment and employability planning stages rather than assigned to a particular educational, training, or employment activity.

Second, child care services may be available, but JOBS participants may not be able to access those services due to a lack of available transportation. This issue was identified as significant in both the field network research and the survey of front-line workers. Third, the availability of services may also reflect a reliance on informal care, and its use may not be captured in the available state and local information. Informal care may be functioning as a "safety valve," as an alternative when formal care is not available or accessible. As one field associate noted:

> Allowing unlicensed caregivers, including close relatives of the families needing child care, has made child care readily available for most clients and has kept child care supply from becoming an impediment to the success of the JOBS program.

Fourth, states were operating JOBS programs primarily on a voluntary basis or giving priority for services to volunteers during this study period (see Hagen & Lurie, 1992). It is possible that those volunteering for the JOBS program have fewer needs for child care than other potential JOBS participants. Additionally, self-initiated participants who volunteer for the JOBS program may have already secured child care arrangements and enroll in the JOBS program in order to obtain payments for child care and other work- related expenses. Finally, recipients with significant needs for child care may be viewed as facing barriers to program participation and thus may be less likely to be enrolled in JOBS activities. Given the need to serve only seven percent of the potential pool, JOBS programs may be choosing to serve those with lower needs for child care, in effect, creaming on the basis of child care needs. As demonstrated by New York City, it was possible to serve only clients with school-age children and meet the seven percent participation rate.

The JOBS legislation significantly increased the availability of child care funding for welfare employment programs, and this liberalized funding has made an important contribution to some states' operations of the JOBS program. However, accessing the federal funding for child care under the JOBS program is dependent on the states' being able to provide the required state matching funds. The limitations on child care funding have already resulted in restricting access to the JOBS program in at least one state and in restricting the availability of child care support for other low-income, but non-AFDC families (Hagen & Lurie, 1992). The findings suggest that a few local sites have begun to experience, or anticipate, these funding shortages for child care. In the three sites noting this concern, the depletion of Title XX funding for child care, which does not

require a state match, was noted as a main factor creating this shortage of funding for child care services.

As the federally mandated rates of JOBS participation increase, the likelihood of confronting inadequate child care funding will also increase. Addressing this situation through increased allocations of state funds appears unlikely, at least in the short term, given the current fiscal constraints of most states. The existing demands on Title XX, as well as its funding limitations, would seem to preclude Title XX from serving as a viable option for meeting the demand for child care services. Alternative strategies, which some states are now pursuing, include closer coordination with early childhood development programs such as Head Start and increased access to alternative funding streams such as child care monies under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The new funding stream provided by the Child Care and Development Block Grant may also alleviate some of the demands on state AFDC funds for child care. Another alternative is to proceed as Minnesota has—restricting access to the JOBS program—or as Philadelphia has—postponing JOBS participation while the client is wait-listed for Title XX child care funding. However, the effectiveness of these strategies may well decrease as the participation rates climb toward 20 percent.

In addition, if state funds for child care are constrained, the lower rates of reimbursement for unregulated or informal care could indirectly promote its use as the preferred type of child care arrangement for JOBS participants. Alternatively, the lower costs associated with informal child care could lead to a type of "creaming" in which those who have access to informal child care services are given preference or priority in JOBS programs.

Although addressed through a variety of approaches, parental choice in the selection of child care has been preserved and safeguarded by the programs considered in this study. There were indications that many sites placed a strong emphasis on the use of formal or regulated child care services. This emphasis was also reflected in data on service usage. However, the data on service usage may well minimize the extent to which informal care is used by JOBS participants. Parental choice may also be restricted as a practical matter—formal child care services may not be available or accessible within some communities.

To make informed choices, parents must have relevant information about child care options and child development. The findings suggest that efforts are under way in a number of states and local sites to increase parent education about child care. These developments were related to

the use of information and referral services as well as the use of child care management agencies in Tennessee and Texas. The attention given to the potential of developing "seamless" child care in Texas was particularly noteworthy.

Although there were concerns in several sites about the payment rates for child care services, both in terms of their being too low and too high, payment levels were sufficient to attract enough providers to enable the agency to meet its participation goal. However, an issue uncovered in several sites was the payment differential between those receiving services under the JOBS program and those receiving services through the JTPA agency. Authorized payments under the JOBS program for child care were higher than those under the JTPA program. This situation may create tension between the local agencies and could potentially interfere with the JTPA providing services to JOBS participants. At a minimum, this situation places the JTPA agency at a disadvantage in arranging service for JTPA clients who are not also JOBS participants.

One of the more interesting developments related to JOBS implementation has been the establishment of child care management systems or brokers. Based on the states in this study, the use of child care brokers appears more likely to occur in states with less mature or long-standing welfare employment programs. The models of child care brokers differed, however, with Tennessee and Texas developing systems that provide fairly intensive services to clients, potentially over a period that extends beyond their participation in the JOBS program. In contrast, Mississippi has developed a system in which the "broker" function involves minimal levels of direct client contact and the function is primarily a clerical one involving the processing of required forms. The complex process for securing child care and the organizational separation between the JOBS staff and the broker agency appeared to slow enrollment in the JOBS program in Mississippi. These factors also appeared to contribute to a reduction in the use of organized care and to an increase in transportation problems. The use of child care management systems merits closer attention because it may offer an alternative model for administering the multiple child care funding streams while also providing important education and linkage services to parents.

CONCLUSION

The JOBS legislation reflects the expectation that mothers, even those with young children, should participate in the labor force to increase their levels of economic self-sufficiency. This approach represents a dramatic shift from the original intentions of the AFDC program, which was to allow mothers to care for their children in their own homes. This change in expectations has been accompanied by the recognition that, to fulfill these expectations, mothers need access to child care services.

In implementing the JOBS program and the associated child care provisions, states to date have fulfilled their obligations to assure that child care is available and provided to at least enough JOBS participants to meet the federally mandated requirements for participation. But such child care issues as funding, access, and transportation must be addressed by states. While these findings indicate that child care is not yet a pressing issue in the implementation of the JOBS program, it is clearly premature to conclude that it will not emerge as a significant barrier to providing education, training, and employment services to welfare recipients as the federally mandated rates of participation increase. Additionally, these findings provide the perspectives of the state and local agency administrators and workers, not those of the clients who may view the issue of child care quite differently and who may find that child care issues become barriers to their on-going participation in the JOBS program and in the workplace.

REFERENCES

Federal Register (1989, October 13). 54: 42146-42267.

Hagen, J.L., and Lurie, I. (1992). *Implementing JOBS: Initial state choices*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Hagen, J. L., and Lurie, I. (1993). The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program and child care: Initial state developments. *Social Service Review*, 66: 198-216.

Hagen, J. L., Lurie, I., and Wang, L. (1993) *Implementing JOBS: The perspective of front-line workers*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government.

APPENDIX A:
JOBS IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

The passage of the Family Support Act of 1988 was accompanied by high expectations for the transformation of the nations' welfare system. The Family Support Act seeks to strengthen the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC recipients through increased enforcement of child support obligations and a new welfare employment program for the provision of education, training, and employment services. This new welfare employment program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS), replaces the Work Incentive Program (WIN) and is a major vehicle by which the Act seeks to increase the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC recipients.

Recognizing the importance of studying the process of implementing JOBS, researchers based at the Rockefeller Institute of Government in Albany—the public policy research arm of the State University of New York—are conducting a ten-state implementation study of the JOBS program extending over three years. The study assesses the implementation of the JOBS program by focusing on two areas: the way states have altered their employment and training programs in response to the Family Support Act and the extent to which local welfare agencies have realized the objectives of the JOBS legislation. To assess the state and local responses to the JOBS legislation, three rounds of research were undertaken. The first round focused on the implementation of the JOBS program at the state level—states' choices, program designs, and issues in implementing the legislation. This state-level information provides the background and context for analyzing program implementation at the local level.

The second round of research focused on JOBS implementation at the local level—the organizational structure, the mechanisms for delivering services, and the resulting opportunities for recipients. The third round assessed the changes made as the states and local agencies gained experience with the JOBS program and came under increasing pressure from the federal mandates to serve more AFDC recipients in their JOBS programs.

The first round of research was scheduled to begin as soon as all states in the sample had implemented the program. The Family Support Act permitted states to implement the JOBS program in July 1989, but they were not required to do so until October 1990. For this reason, the field

research began in October 1990 and examined the status of the program from October through December, 1990. The second round of research examined the status of the JOBS program at the local level during June through August, 1991, and the third round was performed one year later, June through August, 1992.

In several reports, we present the findings on the local implementation of JOBS in 30 sites during June through August, 1991. The findings from the first round of field network research were presented in *Implementing JOBS: Initial State Choices* (Hagen & Lurie, 1992). To provide the context for the findings on local implementation, we have provided both the legislative background as well as the state response to the federal legislation. The findings are based on the structured reports submitted by policy analysts for each of the ten states. The state-level reports reflect state policies as well as the intentions and perspectives of state-level officials and administrators. The local-level reports reflect the perspectives of the local program operators as well as an assessment of the nature and extent of JOBS services provided to AFDC recipients. In some areas, the findings from the field network research are supplemented by findings from a survey of front- line workers responsible for the daily operation of JOBS programs in the local sites.

As a brief introduction to this series of reports presenting findings on the local implementation of the JOBS program, we provide an overview of the federal JOBS legislation, the research methods, and the process of site selection.

JOBS in Brief

The JOBS program is designed "to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence" (42 USC 681 (a)). It builds on previous legislation related to welfare employment programs, including the Work Incentive Program and organizational arrangements and program activities that were permitted under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 and subsequent amendments. Primary responsibility for the JOBS program rests with each state's welfare agency, which was allowed to implement the program in July 1989 and required to do so by October 1990. States must offer educational activities including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education, and English proficiency education; job skills training; job readiness activities; and job development and job placement. Additionally, states must provide at least two of the following: group and individual job

search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience.

Subject to the availability of resources, all non-exempt AFDC recipients are required to participate in the JOBS program. States must guarantee child care if it is necessary for a recipient to participate in the JOBS program. Federal funding for child care is open-ended and matched at the Medicaid rate, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent. In a significant departure from previous legislation, mothers with children ages three or older are required to participate if child care is available. At state option, participation in the JOBS program may be required of parents with children ages one or older. Mothers under twenty years of age who have not completed high school or its equivalent are required to participate in educational activities, regardless of their children's ages.

To encourage states to focus on people who are most likely to become long-term welfare recipients, the federal legislation requires that 55 percent of the JOBS funds be spent on specific categories of recipients who are, or are likely to become, long-term welfare recipients. The legislation has also mandated overall participation rates for states' JOBS programs: seven percent of the non-exempt caseload must participate in 1990; 20 percent in 1995.

To assist states in financing their JOBS programs, federal matching funds have been increased significantly. The limitations on the total amount of federal grants to the states are raised considerably from previous levels of funding; available federal funding in 1990 was $800 million and increases to $1.3 billion in 1995. The federal matching rate is 90 percent up to each state's WIN allocation for 1987. Expenditures for JOBS services beyond that amount are matched at the Medicaid rate or 60 percent, whichever is higher. Supportive services and administrative expenses are matched at 50 percent. (For additional analyses of the Family Support Act, see Abramovitz, 1988; Hagen, 1992; Lurie & Sanger, 1991; Miller, 1989; Nichols-Casebolt & McClure, 1989.)

Research Methods

Field Network Research. The primary research method for data collection during this phase of the study was field network research (Nathan, 1982). Field network research is a method for policy research developed and used to assess revenue sharing, community development block grants, public service employment under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and the Reagan domestic program. The essential feature of this approach is a network of indigenous field researchers

familiar with the programs and political structure and processes of each sample jurisdiction. These field researchers assess the program in their jurisdiction by using a uniform instrument for collecting and analyzing information. The research framework, analytic questions, and data requirements are developed by the central staff of the project. The data collection instruments, or reporting formats, were developed by the central staff in conjunction with the field associates. The instrument consists of open-ended questions and requests narrative statements, quantitative data, and supporting documents. Field researchers gathered the required information in a variety of ways, including on-side observations, interviews with state officials and program staff, and reviews of program materials and reports. After the field researchers have completed their data collection and analysis, the central staff uses the findings from the field to describe and explain inter-jurisdictional variations, confirm or reject hypotheses, and reach conclusions about program implementation.

Survey of Front-Line Workers. As part of the overall study, a survey of front-line workers was conducted to inform our analysis of the local implementation of the JOBS program. Data were collected from front-line workers using a self-administered questionnaire which was distributed to front-line workers in the 29 local sites in the fall of 1991, shortly after the field network research at the local level had been completed. The content of the questionnaire paralleled the study's overall framework for assessing the implementation of JOBS. This framework draws on the major provisions of the JOBS legislation as well as variables identified in previous research as important to implementing welfare employment programs. Additionally, we drew directly on the instruments prepared by the Manpower Development Research Corporation in their studies of the GAIN Program. The questionnaire was self-administered and consisted primarily of closed-ended questions. Completed questionnaires were returned by 929 respondents for a response rate of 68.7 percent. (Further information regarding the survey of front-line workers is presented in a separate report.)

The survey's limitations stem primarily from its reliance on a self-administered questionnaire and the purposive selection of local sites. The length of the questionnaire and the possible sensitivity of questions concerning job satisfaction and attitudes toward welfare recipients may have contributed to respondent bias. Additionally, the data are based on the workers' self-evaluations and self-report and do not measure actual performance. Although the local sites included front-line workers in diverse settings, the sample is geographically limited both across states and within states. It may well not be representative of front-line workers

who provide services to JOBS participants across the country. Qualifications for these positions, job responsibilities, and work environments varied greatly among local agencies. Comparisons across the states must also be approached with caution because of the small number of respondents in some states. Within these limitations, however, the study does provide a comprehensive consideration of the front-line workers' perspective on JOBS implementation.

Selection of the Study States and Local Sites

A major decision in conducting this three-year implementation study was the selection of ten study states. The states in the study are Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas (table A-1). In choosing the ten states, an effort was made to select states that would illustrate a range of state experiences in implementing the JOBS program. Several characteristics of states were identified, and states were chosen to provide diversity according to these characteristics. Economic and fiscal variables are shown in table A-1 and include the poverty rate and the rank by per capita income for the states. To reflect the ability of states to finance welfare expenditures, consideration was given to the level of fiscal stress expected in 1990.

Another criterion was whether the state had introduced a new welfare employment program prior to the JOBS program that enabled it to meet many of the requirements for the program without major restructuring, or whether the state needed to design and implement a new program. Information from a variety of sources as well as the states' expected implementation dates were used to select states with variations in program development. Another factor that may influence the course of JOBS implementation is whether public assistance is administered by the state government or by local government under state supervision. To reflect the national pattern in which two-thirds of the states administer public assistance, seven state-administered programs were chosen for the sample. Consideration was also given to regional balance.

The final variable considered was the state's inclusion in the JOBS Evaluation Study being conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). Their evaluation, mandated by the Family Support Act, will estimate the impact of JOBS services in selected sites using an experimental design. One purpose of the Rockefeller Institute study is to provide a context in which to view the programs evaluated by MDRC. To facilitate comparisons between the two studies, an effort was

made to ensure that some of the states in this sample contained JOBS Evaluation sites selected by MDRC.

To examine the local implementation of the JOBS program, the central staff, in consultation with the field associates selected three local sites in each of the ten states. Local sites were selected on the basis of a number of criteria, including geographic location within the state, size of the local community, and AFDC caseload characteristics. In each state, a site was selected which reflected a rural environment, a mid-sized city, and a more metropolitan area of the state. Specifically excluded from consideration were local sites within the state participating in MDRC's JOBS Evaluation Study. The experimental designs being used in these sites created exceptional situations for the implementation of the JOBS program. Our focus was on the more typical JOBS programs. Table A-2 provides a listing of the local sites.

References

Abramovitz, M. (1988). Why welfare reform is a sham. *Nation*, September 26: 236-240.

Hagen, J.L. (1992). Women, work, and welfare: Is there a role for social work? *Social Work*, 37: 9-14.

Hagen, J.L., and Lurie, I. (1992). *Implementing JOBS: Initial state choices*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Lurie, I., and Sanger, M.B. (1991). The Family Support Act: Defining the social contract in New York. *Social Service Review*, 65: 43-67.

Miller, D.C. (1989). Poor women and work programs: Back to the future. *Affilia*, 4: 9-22.

Nathan, R.P. (1982). The methodology of field network evaluation studies. In W. Williams (Ed.), *Studying implementation: Methodological and administrative issues* (pp. 73-99). Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.

Nichols-Casebolt, A., and McClure, J. (1989). Social work support for welfare reform: The latest surrender in the war on poverty. *Social Work*, 34: 77-80.

Table A-1: Criteria for Selecting States

	Implementation Date	Income Rank	Poverty Rate (percent)	Fiscal Stress
State Administered				
Michigan	7/89	17	14.4	S
Mississippi	10/90	50	25.6	S
Oklahoma	7/89	37	15.5	—
Oregon	10/90	31	12.6	—
Pennsylvania	10/89	21	12.4	S
Tennessee	10/90	38	17.8	S
Texas	10/90	26	16.2	—
State Supervised				
Maryland	7/89	7	8.5	—
Minnesota	7/89	15	11.5	S
New York	10/90	5	15.2	D

Source:

Rank of per capita personal income and poverty rate: National Conference of State Legislatures, State-Local Fiscal Indicators, January 1990, p.86.

Fiscal Stress: Ronald Snell, "The State Fiscal Outlook: 1990 and the Coming Decade," *State Legislative Report*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (Denver, Colorado: National Conference of State Legislatures, February 1990).

D=Expected Deficit in FY 1990; S=Possible revenue shortfall in FY 1990.

Table A-2: Local Sites Selected for the Study

State	Sites
Maryland	Baltimore City Anne Arundel Dorchester County
Michigan	Wayne County Kalamazoo County Tuscola County
Minnesota	Hennepin County Blue Earth County Itasca County
Mississippi	Hinds County Harrison County Quitman County
New York	New York City Oneida County Franklin County
Oklahoma	Tulsa County Carter County LeFlore County
Oregon	Springfield Medford LaGrande
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Blair County Clinton County
Tennessee	Davidson County Sullivan County Gibson County
Texas	Harris County Nueces County Bee County

APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF WORKERS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

As with the overall sample, the respondents responsible for child care services were predominately women (81 percent), and their average age was 38.2 years. The majority of the respondents were white and, as shown in table A, the respondents came from a wide range of educational backgrounds. Two-thirds of the respondents had a bachelor's degree or higher. The respondents were employed primarily by local welfare agencies (80 percent); 12 percent were employed by various community-based organizations, and 8 percent by the local Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) agency.

Overall, these respondents were experienced workers. They had worked in human services positions for an average of 9.5 years and in their current agencies for 7 years. Michigan, Oregon, and Pennsylvania were more likely to have even longer-term workers. In these states, workers had been employed in their current agencies for 13, 12, and 15 years respectively. In contrast, Mississippi and Tennessee workers had been in their agencies for 4 and 4.6 years respectively. In their current positions, 37.5 percent reported earning an annual salary of $20,000 or less, and 55.3 percent earned between $20.001 and $30,000.

In addition to having agency responsibilities for child care services, these workers also assumed responsibility for a number of other functions central to the operation of the JOBS program (table B-1). The most common function, performed by 82.5 percent of the respondents, was referral to educational, employment, and training services. Additionally, however, 60 percent or more respondents were also responsible for such functions as assessments, employability plans, and case management. Slightly more than one-half of the respondents were also involved with AFDC eligibility determinations or redeterminations. Involvement with AFDC eligibility was most likely to occur in New York, Oklahoma, and Oregon; it was least likely to occur in Minnesota and Texas, where workers were also least likely to be involved in screening for referral to the JOBS program.

The average monthly caseload was 130 cases, but the caseloads ranged from 82 cases in Oklahoma to 230 cases in Pennsylvania. Respondents

estimated that 63 percent of their caseload was comprised of JOBS participants and that they had contact with 60 percent of the entire caseload each month. Workers responsible for child care services split their time each week between two functions, direct contact with clients and completion of required data entry and reports (table B-2). Collaborative work with other staff within the agency or with staff at other community agencies accounted for about 20 percent of their work week.

Table B-1: Characteristics of Respondents Providing Child Care Services (N=274)

Respondent Characteristics	Means/Percentages
Sex	
Male	19.0%
Female	81.0%
Ethnic Background	
Black/African American	24.0%
Caucasian	64.2%
Hispanic	5.5%
Other	6.4%
Educational achievement	
High school	9.2%
AA/AS	12.8%
BA/BS	56.0%
Master's or above	11.7%
Other	10.3%
Age	38.2
Number of years in human service positions	9.5
Number of years employed by the agency	7.0
Number of years in current job title	4.1

Table B-1 continued on next page.

Table B-1: Characteristics of Respondents Providing Child Care Services (N=274) (continued)

Respondent Characteristics	Means/Percentages
Salary	
$10,000 or less	0.8%
$10,001-$15,000	6.7%
$482;$15,001-$20,000	30.0%
$20,001-$25,000	40.7%
$25,001-$30,000	14.6%
More than $30,000	7.1%
Previous Welfare Recipient	
Yes	18.8%
No	81.2%
Job Responsibilities	
Referrals to education, employment, & training services	82.5%
Monitoring and tracking of client participation	71.9%
Assessments for JOBS	62.4%
Screening for referral to JOBS program	62.0%
Case management services for JOBS	61.7%
Employability plans for JOBS	60.9%
AFDC eligibility determinations/redeterminations	53.3%
Average caseload size	129.9
Agency Base	
Welfare	79.5%
Community-Based Organizations (CBO)	11.7%
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) agency	7.5%

Table B-2: Weekly Time Allocations for Workers Providing Child Care Services

Activity	Percent of Time*
Direct contact with clients in person and by phone	42.1
Required data entry, report completion, and other paperwork	38.0
Direct contact with other staff in the agency	12.2
Collaborative work with other community agencies	7.9

* Exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

APPENDIX C:
FIELD ASSOCIATES

Maryland	Jeffrey J. Koshel, Planning and Evaluation Consultant Washington, D.C.
Michigan	Colletta H. Moser, Professor Department of Agricultural Economics Michigan State University
Minnesota	Sharon K. Patten, Senior Fellow Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota Associate Professor Department of Social Work, Augsburg College
Mississippi	Lewis H. Smith, Professor Department of Economics, University of Mississippi
New York	Jan Hagen, Associate Professor School of Social Welfare, University at Albany State University of New York
	Irene Lurie, Associate Professor Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy University at Albany, State University of New York
Oklahoma	Kenneth R. Wedel, Professor School of Social Work, University of Oklahoma
Oregon	Norman L. Wyers, Professor Graduate School of Social Work, Portland State University
Pennsylvania	Thomas F. Luce, Jr., Assistant Professor The Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (Formerly at Pennsylvania State University)
Tennessee	Robert E. Fulton, Public Policy Analyst Patton, Missouri
Texas	Christopher T. King, Associate Director Center for the Study of Human Resources Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs The University of Texas at Austin

Field Associates' Biographies

Robert E. Fulton is now an independent public policy analyst living in Missouri. He was Secretary of Social Services in the Oklahoma Governor's Cabinet from November 1987 to January 1991. In this capacity, he assisted the Governor in providing oversight and liaison for eight state agencies. Prior to joining the Governor's Cabinet, Fulton served for 4 1/2 years as Director of Oklahoma's largest state agency, the Department of Human Services. Before going to Oklahoma in 1983, Fulton served for six years on the staff of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, including two years as Chief Counsel for that Committee. Prior to joining the Senate Budget Committee staff, Fulton served for a total of 21 years in five different federal agencies. His service included a 1976 appointment by President Ford as Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Fulton served on the Board of Directors of the American Public Welfare Association from 1987 to 1989. Fulton served on the American Public Welfare Association's committee that produced the "One Child in Four" report and helped create the momentum leading to the enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988.

Christopher T. King is Associate Director, Center for the Study of Human Resources, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Austin. Dr. King is an economist with an interest in welfare, education, and employment programs, both nationwide and in Texas. He is an expert on the Job Training Partnership Act, having served as the principal editor for the report of the U.S. Job Training Partnership Act Advisory Committee issued in March 1989. He has been a consultant to many governmental and private organizations and continues to conduct research on the JOBS Program in Texas with funding from the Texas Department of Human Services and several other state agencies.

Jeffrey J. Koshel is an economist who is a private consultant in Washington, D.C. He has had extensive experience monitoring and evaluating work/welfare programs, social service programs, and other human resource programs while serving on the staffs of the National Governors Association, the Urban Institute, and the Congressional Budget Office. He currently provides planning and evaluation assistance to administrators of state and local governmental and private agencies serving at-risk populations. As a consultant to Montgomery County, Maryland, he is evaluating the county's initiative in adding a cash supplement to the state's welfare program.

Thomas F. Luce, Jr., is an assistant professor of public affairs and planning at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He has worked extensively on economic development and public finance in Pennsylvania. Prior to moving to Minnesota, he taught at Pennsylvania State University and worked with the Wharton Economic Monitoring Project at the University of Pennsylvania. He co-authored three volumes on finance and economic development in the Philadelphia area. He has also published work on fiscal issues in the Pittsburgh area, state government science and technology-based economic development programs in Pennsylvania and other states, and intergovernmental fiscal relations.

Colletta H. Moser is a professor of agricultural economics at Michigan State University and Employment, Training, and Public Policy Specialist, Cooperative Extension Service. Her expertise is labor economics, and she is co-author of Labor Economics and Labor Relations, a textbook now in its tenth edition. She has an extensive background in manpower policies, with a special focus on rural issues. From 1986 to 1988, she was principal investigator for grants from the Michigan Department of Labor, Title III Dislocated Workers Job Training Partnership Act for retraining financially distressed Michigan farm family members and their employees.

Sharon K. Patten is a senior fellow at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, and an associate professor in the department of social work at Augsburg College. As a consultant in policy analysis and program evaluation, Dr. Patten has consulted with numerous government and nonprofit agencies, including several county social service departments and the Minnesota Department of Public Welfare. She has conducted numerous evaluation and policy studies, frequently focusing on financing and quality assurance, and has also developed and tested client assessment instruments.

Lewis H. Smith is a professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Mississippi. He is a labor economist who has studied various aspects of labor markets in the South as well as the effectiveness of training, relocation, and job search activities. Dr. Smith has also written on welfare and public service employment programs in the rural South. He is unique among the field associates in having been a field associate in several field network research projects directed by Richard Nathan and others: the Study of the Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act, the Study of the Impact of Reagan's Domestic Programs

on State and Local Governments, and the field network evaluation of the Public Service Employment Program.

Kenneth R. Wedel, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Oklahoma, may be unique among our field associates in having served as a county welfare director early in his career. His expertise rests in public administration and public welfare policies. Professor Wedel's scholarly publications in this area have concentrated on issues related to the purchase of social services by the government. These issues include the monitoring of service contracts and the use of performance-based contracts in social services. Additionally, he is co-author of a forthcoming book on the evaluation of social programs.

Norman L. Wyers, Professor, School of Social Work, Portland State University, has conducted public policy research on public welfare policies, specifically AFDC. He has made a significant contribution to the social welfare literature by examining the roles and functions of income maintenance workers. In addition to his scholarly publications, Dr. Wyers has been active in serving as a consultant to various public organizations, including the Department of Human Services, State of Oregon. He also has provided testimony before various committees of the Oregon State Legislature, the Governor's Task Force on Welfare Reform, and the Welfare Reform Subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives.